

### **REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments which have greatly assisted the Applicant in responding. The following remarks are numbered following the Examiner's Office Action numbers.

#### **In The Claims:**

1. The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), as not showing every feature of the invention in the claims.

Claims 20 and 31 have been amended. The amended Claims 20 and 31 do not include "a means for easily attaching". Therefore, the objection to the drawing is now deemed moot and should be withdrawn.

2. The Examiner has rejected Claims 6-7 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains.

Claims 6-7, 32 have been amended by replacing the phrase "remote server" with the phrase "registration server", which is fully supported by the description Page 9 Line 21 ("a user registers a MWID"). It is inherent that the user registers a MWID to a registration server. Therefore, Claims 6-7 and 32 should be allowed.

3. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 12-13, 20, 26 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 12-13, 20, 26 and 31 have been amended as to remove the terms "easily" and "quickly". The amended claim now particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter, and therefore should be allowed.

4. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 19, 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Venturini.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claims 1, 19 and 31 further limits the message-indicating device to have specific shape and dimension. Said specific shape and dimension limitation on the message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention. It is neither disclosed nor suggested by Venturini or any other cited references. Therefore, the subject matter in independent Claims 1, 19, 31 is patentably distinguished from the cited references and Claims 1, 19, 31 should be allowed.

Claim 5, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention. Because Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 5 should be also allowed.

Claim 6 is amended to further limit the "first server" to a "first registration server". The subject matter "first registration server" is patentably different from the cited subject matter "memory" of a mobile terminal because the memory of mobile terminal is not a registration server to which a user registers said identification code and said associations. Further, the amended Claim 6, which depends on independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention. Therefore, Claim 6 should be allowed.

Claim 8, which depends on the independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention. Because Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 8 should also be allowed.

5. The Examiner has rejected Claims 26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Amin.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 26 further limits the message-indicating device to have specific shape and dimension. Said specific shape and dimension limitation on the message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention. Amin discloses only *one* message-indicating device "Telephone answering device" or *one* mobile wireless device, while Claim 26 of the present invention involves a *plurality* of message-indicating devices. Further, "the user of a registered mobile station can have a distinctive ringing sound" is not the same as the claimed subjected matter "identifying a subset of said communication waiting communication waiting indication devices based on said first communication." The subject matter of amended Claim 26 is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. It is patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, the independent Claim 26 should be allowed.

Regarding Claim 30, the term "distinctive alerting" disclosed by Amin is too vague and lack of detail, and thus cannot cover any of the claimed "user profile reflects user-specifiable criteria for determining when an indicator of a device in said set of devices is to be actuated." Further, Claim 30, which depends on the amended independent Claim 26, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This feature is unique to this invention. It is neither disclosed, nor suggested by Amin and any other cited references. Because the independent Claim 26 is allowable, Claim 30 should also be allowed.

6. The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Neustein.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 2, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by Venturini

and Neustein, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 2 should also be allowed.

Claim 3, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 3 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 3 should also be allowed.

7. The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Shull.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 4, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Shull, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 4 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 4 should also be allowed.

8. The Examiner has rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Jyogataki.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited references do not suggest or teach subject matter "storing said identification code and said associations on a first registration server". Further, Claim 7, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Jyogataki, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references.

The subject matter of Claim 7 is fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 7 should be allowed.

9. The Examiner has rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of LuPorta.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 9, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of LuPorta, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 9 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 9 should be allowed.

10. The Examiner has rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Houggy.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 10, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Houggy, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 10 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 10 should be allowed.

11. The Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Homan.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding Claim 11, each of Venturini and Homan only discloses *one* communication and *one* message-indicating device, which may be chosen among a variety of choices, to be used to receive the communication. There is no suggestion by the cited

references to registering *more than one* message-indicating devices, and direct the first communication to the first message-indicating device and the second communication to the second message-indicating device, as claimed. Further, Claim 11, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Homan, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 11 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 11 should be allowed.

12. The Examiner has rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Neustein.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 12 now limits the message-indicating device to have specific shape and dimension. Said specific shape and dimension limitation on the message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 12 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 12 should be allowed.

13. The Examiner has rejected Claims 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Kyte.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 13 now limits the message-indicating device to have specific shape and dimension. Said specific shape and dimension limitation on the message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 13 is also

fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 13 should be allowed.

Claim 17, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 17 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 17 should be allowed.

14. The Examiner has rejected Claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Kyte and further in view of Neistein.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 14, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Kyte and further in view of Neistein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 14 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 14 should be allowed.

Claim 15, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 15 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 15 should be allowed.

15. The Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Shull.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 16, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Shull, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 16 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 16 should be allowed.

16. The Examiner has rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Houggy.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 18, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Houggy, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 18 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 18 should be allowed.

17. The Examiner has rejected Claims 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and in view of Neustein.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 20 now limits the apparatus to have specific shape and dimension. Said specific shape and dimension limitation on the message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention and cannot be found in Venturini and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 20 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 20 should be allowed.



The amended Claim 21, which depends on the amended independent Claim 20, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 21 is fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 21 should be allowed.

18. The Examiner has rejected Claims 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein and in view of Shull.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 22, which depends on the amended independent Claim 20, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Shull, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 22 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 22 should be allowed.

The amended Claim 23, which depends on the amended Claim 20, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein/Shull and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 23 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 23 should be allowed.

19. The Examiner has rejected Claims 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein and in view of Kyte et al.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 24, which depends on the amended Claim 20, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 24 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 24 should be allowed.

The amended Claim 25, which depends on the amended Claim 20, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 25 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 25 should be allowed.

20. The Examiner has rejected Claims 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and further in view of Neustein.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 27, which depends on the amended Claim 26, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Amin and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 27 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 27 should be allowed.

Claim 28, which depends on the amended Claim 26, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limitation which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Amin/Neustein and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 28 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 28 should be allowed.

21. The Examiner has rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and in view of Kyte.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 29, which depends on the amended Claim 26, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Amin and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 29 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 29 should be allowed.

22. The Examiner has rejected Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and in view of Kyte.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 32, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 32 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 32 should be allowed.

23. The Examiner has rejected Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Houggy.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 33, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and in view of Houggy, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 33 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 33 should be allowed.

24. The Examiner has rejected Claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Homan.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding Claim 34, each of Ventureini, Kyte and Homan only discloses *one* communication and *one* message-indicating device, which may be chosen among a variety of choices, to be used to receive the communication. There is no suggestion by the cited references to register *more than one* message-indicating devices, and direct the first communication to the first message-indicating device and the second communication to the second message-indicating device, as claimed. Further, Claim 34, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and in view of Homan, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 34 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 34 should be allowed.

25. The Examiner has rejected Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and in view of Neustein.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 35, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the specific shape and dimension limit which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 35 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 35 should be allowed.

26. Response to "Response to Arguments":

- i) The argument with "attaching" means/ "attaching" step was removed. And a new set of argument has been set forth in previous paragraphs.

- ii) The limitation to "first remote server" was changed to "first registration server". The invention discloses "a user registers a MWID". It is inherent that the user is registering to a "registration server".
- iii) Regarding Claim 30, the argument against 102(e) rejection has been set forth in previous paragraphs.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Applicant considers this invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the objections and rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the this application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kirk D. Wong', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Kirk D. Wong  
Reg. No. 43,284

Customer No. 22862

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

**In The Claims:**

1. A method of indicating receipt of a communication, comprising:

registering a first message-indicating device for a user, said device comprising an indicator;

receiving notification of receipt of a first communication directed to the user;

[attaching said device to a location from which said indicator can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated]; and

initiating a first wireless signal to said device;

wherein in response to said first signal, said indicator activates to alert the user[.];  
and

wherein said first message-indicating device is typically of rounded square shape with a dimension which is typically .5" long by .5" wide by .3" thick.

6. The method of claim 5, further comprising:

storing said identification code and said associations on a first [remote]  
registration server; and

configuring said first [remote]registration server to automatically initiate said first wireless signal to said device in response to notification of receipt of one of said one or more types of communications.

7. The method of claim 5, further comprising:

storing said identification code and said associations on a first  
[remote]registration server;

receiving from the user a selection of one or more criteria identifying when said first signal should be sent in response to receipt of a first type of communication; and

configuring said first [remote]registration server to automatically initiate said first wireless signal to said device when:

it is determined that said first type of communication is received for the user; and

said one or more criteria are satisfied.

12. A method of using a message-waiting device to notify a user of receipt of a communication for the user, the method comprising:

receiving a communication directed to a user;

initiating a first electronic signal to a first message-waiting device associated with the user, wherein said first message-waiting device includes an indicator and said first electronic signal is configured to activate said indicator;

[attaching said device to a location from which said indicator can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated;]

providing said communication to said user; and

after said providing, automatically initiating a second electronic signal to said first message-waiting device, wherein said second electronic signal is configured to deactivate said indicator[.];

wherein said first message-indicating device is typically of rounded square shape with a dimension which is typically .5" long by .5" wide by .3" thick.

13. A method of indicating receipt of a communication, comprising:

receiving a first wireless signal at a first message-indicating device, wherein said first device includes an alarm;

[attaching said device to a location from which said alarm can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated;]

activating said alarm in response to said first wireless signal; and

deactivating said alarm;

wherein receipt of said first wireless signal indicates that a first communication was directed to a user of said first device[.]; and

wherein said first message-indicating device is typically of rounded square shape with a dimension which is typically .5" long by .5" wide by .3" thick.

19. A computer readable storage medium storing instructions that, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform a method of indicating receipt of a communication, the method comprising:

registering a first message-indicating device for a user, said device comprising an indicator;

receiving notification of receipt of a first communication directed to the user; and

[attaching said device to a location from which said indicator can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated; and]



initiating a first wireless signal to said device;

wherein in response to said first signal, said indicator activates to alert the user[.];

and

wherein said first message-indicating device is typically of rounded square shape with a dimension which is typically .5" long by .5" wide by .3" thick.

20. A portable apparatus for indicating receipt of a communication, comprising:

a signal receiver configured to receive a first wireless signal generated after receipt of a communication; and

an indicator configured to activate in response to receipt of said first signal; [and]

[a means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified;-]

wherein said indicator is configured to deactivate in response to a second signal;

and

wherein said apparatus is typically of rounded square shape with a dimension which is typically .5" long by .5" wide by .3" thick.

26. A method of indicating a communication waiting status for a user, comprising:

receiving notification of a first communication for a first user;

accessing a user profile of the first user, said user profile identifying a set of communication waiting indication devices associated with the first user, wherein each device in said set of devices comprises an indicator;

[attaching each of said devices to a location from which said indicator of each device in said set of devices can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated;]

identifying a subset of said communication waiting indication devices based on said first communication; and

initiating a first wireless signal to said subset of devices, wherein in response to said first wireless signal said indicators of said subset of devices are actuated[.]; and

wherein said first message-indicating device is typically of rounded square shape with a dimension which is typically .5" long by .5" wide by .3" thick.

31. A communication waiting indication system comprising:

a first communication waiting indication device associated with a first user, said first device comprising an alarm; and

a notification server configured to issue a first wireless signal toward said first device in response to receipt of a first communication for the first user;

[wherein said indication device containing a means for easily attaching said device to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified; and]

wherein in response to said first wireless signal, said alarm is activated[.]; and

wherein said first message-indicating device is typically of rounded square shape with a dimension which is typically .5" long by .5" wide by .3" thick .

32. The system of claim 31, wherein said first device has an identification code, further comprising:

a first [remote]registration server configured to store said identification code in association with a first user profile for the first user;

wherein said first user profile is configured to identify one or more types of communication, including said first communication, in response to which said first wireless signal is to be initiated toward said first device.